arXiv:cond-mat/9610146v1 [cond-mat.supr-con] 18 Oct 1996

Stability of Elastic Glass Phases in Random Field XY Magnets and Vortex Lattices in Type II Superconductors

Daniel S. Fisher

Department of Physics, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138

Abstract

A description of a dislocation-free elastic glass phase in terms of domain walls is developed and used as the basis of a renormalization group analysis of the energetics of dislocation loops added to the system. It is found that even after optimizing over possible paths of large dislocation loops, their energy is still very likely to be positive when the dislocation core energy is large. This implies the existence of an equilibrium elastic glass phase in three dimensional random field X-Y magnets, and a dislocation free, bond-orientationally ordered "Bragg glass" phase of vortices in dirty Type II superconductors.

Typeset using REVTEX

It has been believed for a long time that systems with quenched randomness that couple to a continuous symmetry order parameter cannot exhibit long range order in less than four dimensions. [1]- [4] Originally it was argued that positional order of Abrikosov vortex lattices in superconductors would be destroyed by random pinning. [1] Recently for a class of random systems including X-Y magnets in a random magnetic field, [2] the absence of long range order has been proven rigorously. [3] Yet an intriguing open question remains: for weak randomness in such systems, are they simply disordered at low temperatures or can phases exist which exhibit some kind of topological or other type of order that distinguishes them from high temperature disordered phases? This issue has resurfaced in the context of vortices in high temperature superconductors; various authors have either implicitly assumed, raised the question of, or given qualitative arguments for, the existence of an *elastic vortex glass* phase which is locally lattice like and is free of large dislocation loops. [5]- [7] Such a phase would probably have power law Bragg-like singularities in its structure factor and in addition, have true bond orientational long range order, [7] thus providing a counter-example to the general conjecture mentioned above. [4]

In the simpler context of three dimensional random field X-Y magnets, Gingras and Huse [8] have explicitly conjectured, and given some numerical evidence in support of, the existence of a phase transition to a defect-free phase for weak-randomness at low temperatures. Yet at this point, no convincing analytical arguments to support or deny the existence of an elastic glass phase have been put forth, [7], [9] although the delicate balance between elastic randomness and dislocation energies has been pointed out by Giamarchi and Le Doussal [7].

In this paper, we explicitly study the stability of a putative elastic glass phase in a three dimensional random field X-Y model to dislocation loops—to avoid confusion, we will refer to the relevant topological defects in all these systems as "dislocations". To do this we must first reconsider the behavior of the ground state and excitations of an elastic glass model with dislocations excluded by fiat. The framework that will be developed, naturally allows one to analyze the energetics of a dislocation loop that is added to the system. If the core energy of the dislocation line is sufficiently large, it is found that, even after optimizing over

the possible paths of a dislocation loop, large loops cost energy with high probability. This situation can be achieved for a weak random field X-Y model and we thus conclude that an elastic glass phase *should exist* in this system in three dimensions.

By analogy, our results are applied to other systems, especially the elastic vortex glass.

Our basic starting point will be the elastic glass model with hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H} = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{(xy)} \left[\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)\right]^2 - h\sum_x \cos\left[\varphi(x) - \gamma(x)\right] \tag{1}$$

with $\gamma(x)$ independent quenched random variables on each site uniformly distributed on $[-\pi, \pi]$ and $\varphi(x)\epsilon(-\infty, \infty)$. This model has been extensively studied by a variety of techniques, including an approximate real-space renormalization group (RG) [10], a perturbative $4-\epsilon$ RG expansion [7] and an approximate variational replica symmetry breaking (RSB) calculation. [7] At all temperatures the behavior is controlled by a zero temperature fixed point whose properties yield disorder averaged (denoted by an overbar) mean square phase variations

$$\overline{<\left[\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)\right]^2>} \approx 2A\ln|x-y| \tag{2}$$

at large distances, with A a universal coefficient computable in the $4-\epsilon$ expansion. [7] It is believed that the mean correlation function will decay as $\overline{< e^{i\varphi(x)}e^{-i\varphi(y)} >} \sim \frac{1}{(x-y)^\eta}$ (although the gaussian variational RSB [7] result that $\eta = A$ should *not* be correct). These results have essentially been obtained from coarse graining or Fourier space representation of the phase variables. Unfortunately, this framework does not appear to be naturally amenable to consideration of dislocations, for these intrinsically involve, as we shall see, physics on many length scales.

A complementary and more complete picture of the elastic glass phase can be constructed in terms of domain walls which turn out to be the natural objects at long length scales. This is most easily seen by studying the limit $h \to \infty$ so that $\varphi(x) = \gamma(x) + 2\pi n(x)$ with $\{n(x)\}$ integers. The ground state can then be represented [up to a uniform shift in the $\{n(x)\}$] by the oriented surfaces through which $n(x)$ changes by ± 1. The typical

$\varphi(x) - \varphi(y) \sim \pm\sqrt{A \ln(x-y)}$ arises from a sum of random $\pm 2\pi$ terms from crossing the nested set of closed surfaces enclosing x and y; these occur typically on scales $1, B, B^2 \cdots$ with $B \sim e^{1/A}$. In contrast, the coarse grained φ averaged over regions of size of order $\frac{1}{2}|x-y|$ will vary from x to y by only $O(1)$.

We will primarily be interested in studying the ground states of the system with different boundary conditions—later including boundary conditions induced by dislocations. Thus rather than working with the surfaces across which $n(x)$ changes, it is useful, as for Ising spin glasses, [11] to consider configurations *relative* to the ground state $\{n_G(x)\}$ with some chosen fixed boundary conditions; any state can then be represented by the set of *oriented domain walls* across which $n(x) - n_G(x)$ changes. A crucial question is the typical energy of the minimal domain wall excitation, ε_L, that surrounds a chosen volume L^3.

The observation that the coarse grained φ has variation of O(1) strongly suggests from the scaling of the elastic energy in Eq. (1), that

$$\varepsilon_L \sim L^\theta \text{ with } \theta = 1 \tag{3}$$

(generally $\theta = d-2$). This can be seen more explicitly by fixing $\varphi(x_1 = 0, x_2, x_3) = 0$ in a system of size $L \times L \times L$ and letting $\varphi(x_1 = L, x_2, x_3)$ change from zero, which defines the reference state $\{n_G(x)\}$, to 2π, with periodic boundary conditions in $x_2 \to x_2 + L$ and $x_3 \to x_3 + L$. This forces a single domain wall spanning the system and changes the energy by E_L. We can now make use of the powerful statistical symmetry of the model hamiltonian Eq. (1): if φ is replaced by $\varphi = \varphi_D + \psi$ with φ_D single valued module 2π and $\nabla^2 \varphi_D = 0$ [with lattice derivative operators] then the *statistical* properties of

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}(\psi) = \mathcal{H} - \frac{1}{2}\sum |\nabla \varphi_D|^2 \tag{4}$$

with constant boundary conditions on ψ are identical to those of $\mathcal{H}(\varphi)$ with constant boundary conditions on φ. Choosing $\varphi_D = \frac{2\pi x_1}{L}$, this implies that the mean energy of the forced domain wall is $\overline{E_L} = \frac{1}{2}(2\pi)^2 L$. The necessary balance of the random part of the energy with the mean elastic part ($\sim L$), implies that this is consistent only if the variations of the spanning wall energy, E_L are also of order L; i.e. $\theta = 1$.

If in the L^3 system, the boundary condition at $x_1 = L$ is changed to $\varphi = 2\pi s$, then s spanning domain walls will be forced. Because these are closer together for larger s, they can less easily optimize their positions and their energy will be larger. Following arguments for confined directed polymers, [12] we consider each section of domain wall of scale L/s. Roughly, these are transversely confined by the others on scale L/s. Thus we guess that the mean energy of a section will be of order L/s yielding, with s^3 sections, a total increase in the mean energy $\overline{E_L} \sim Ls^2$ in agreement with the result from the statistical symmetry. The sample-to-sample variations in E_L can be guessed from a central limit sum of s^3 roughly independent variations of each section yielding $\delta E_L \sim s(L/s)\sqrt{s^3}$. For $s \sim \frac{L}{2}$, this yields $\delta E_L \sim L^{\frac{3}{2}}$ as should be expected since the resulting system's ground state—and indeed its hamiltonian $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$—is very different everywhere from the $s = 0$ reference system.

The main lesson from the above is that sections of optimal domain walls on scales L that are *confined on the same scale* L, typically have energy that is distributed with positive mean and variations both of order L. If we try to put several distinct domain walls of scale L into a volume of order L^3, the energy of each of them will have to increase.

We now consider inserting a single dislocation loop of radius R into a fixed position of the system by making φ multivalued with $\nabla \times \nabla\varphi = 2\pi$ on plaquettes through which the dislocation loop passes and $\nabla \times \nabla\varphi = 0$ elsewhere. If the core energy per unit length of the dislocation is ϵ_0, the statistical tilt symmetry implies that the extra groundstate energy, D_R, due to the dislocation has mean

$$\overline{D_R} = 2\pi R\,[\epsilon_0 + \pi \ln R] \tag{5}$$

with the short-scale cutoff of $\ln R$ absorbed into ϵ_0. How can we understand this in terms of domain walls? The dislocation loop forces in a single domain wall that spans the loop. The sections of the wall of scale $L = 1$ adjacent to the loop are confined on this scale and thus each have mean energy of order 1 and roughly independent variations of this same order. The sections of scale $L = 2$ are attached to these which confines them on scale $L = 2$ and gives each a mean energy of order 2; and so on, on scales 4, 8, 16 up to $L \sim R$. Thus each

factor of two in scale will contribute a factor of R to $\overline{D_R}$ yielding the $R \ln R$ of Eq. (5). But the variations δD_R of D_R will be much smaller: from each scale L there will be a random contribution $\pm (R/L)^{\frac{1}{2}} L$, from the sum of order R/L roughly independent variations of sections of scale L. The typical variations in D_R are thus

$$\delta D_R \sim R \tag{6}$$

which are dominated by the *largest* scale section of the wall.

For a large *fixed* dislocation loop, the energy is thus very likely to be large and positive. But we must consider the optimization of the dislocation energy over all possible paths of the dislocation loop in a region of volume of order R^3. We do this by an approximate renormalization group analysis of the effects of sections of the wall at each length scale on the optimal path with minimum energy of a segment of the dislocation loop.

We focus on transverse deformations of a dislocation segment by distances of order W with the effects of smaller scale deformations of the dislocation and the concomitant changes in the sections of wall attached to it on scales smaller than W, included in an effective mean dislocation energy per unit length $\tilde{\epsilon}_W$ with local variations around this value. If the dislocation were straight on smaller scales, $\tilde{\epsilon}_W$ would be simply $\epsilon_0 + \pi \ln W$ but we expect it to be reduced from this by the smaller scale deformations. Our task is to iteratively understand how the deformations on a scale W change $\tilde{\epsilon}$ on larger scales.

In the continuum approximation, (valid on large scales) the typical excess energy cost of a transverse distortion of a segment of length Λ of the dislocation by an amount $W << \Lambda$ will be $\frac{1}{2}\tilde{\epsilon}_W W^2/\Lambda$ from the extra length of the dislocation. Such a distorted dislocation segment will have a different spanning wall attached to it than the straight (on scale W) segment. But if this spanning wall were completely different over the whole length Λ, it would imply the existence of many ($\sim \Lambda/W$) distinct minimal walls in a volume Λ^3 which is highly improbable by the earlier discussion of confined walls. What should be expected, instead, is that the minimal spanning walls attached to the two different paths of the dislocation will typically only differ in a strip of width W near the dislocation, with all of them attaching

to the *same* optimal wall further away.

Each section of scale W will be roughly independent and the mean energy of each of these sections of the two wall configurations will be the same with differences between them also of order W. Thus the *total difference* in the attached spanning wall energies between the energies of the distorted and undistorted segment will be of order $\pm \left(\frac{\Lambda}{W}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} W$. Balancing this difference against the excess effective core energy cost of the distortion from above, yields the typical length Λ_W over which transverse deformations of size W will occur:

$$\Lambda_W \sim W \tilde{\epsilon}_W^{\frac{2}{3}} \tag{7}$$

which is $>> W$ if $\tilde{\epsilon}_W$ is large.

At the next length scale, $2W$, the effective $\tilde{\epsilon}$ will change. The inclusion of the wall segments of scale W increases the mean energy of a length Λ_W segment by $\sim W(\Lambda_W/W)$ but the optimization over the scale W deformation of the dislocation decreases it by $\sim (\Lambda_W/W)^{\frac{1}{2}} W$. Thus we find that

$$\tilde{\epsilon}_{2W} \approx \tilde{\epsilon}_W + \pi \ln 2 - \alpha/\tilde{\epsilon}_W^{\frac{1}{3}}. \tag{8}$$

with α some coefficient.

This is our key result: although the arguments leading to it are not precise, the *form* should be correct for large $\tilde{\epsilon}_W$. The RG flow of Eq. (8) implies that the delicate balance [7] between the $R \ln R$ terms in D_R and its $\pm R$ variations, as well as that implied by the almost linear growth in Eq. (7) of dislocation distortions W_Λ with Λ, is resolved by the dominance of the deterministic terms in the dislocation energy over even the optimal random ones.

For sufficiently large ϵ_0, the renormalized energy of the lowest energy dislocation loop of radius R in a volume $\sim R^3$ can now be obtained by renormalizing until a scale W_R at which $\Lambda_W \sim R$. On longer scales, the optimal dislocation loop of radius R will look essentially circular but can still reduce its energy by rotating or moving within the region of volume $\sim R^3$. From scales W in the range $R > W > W_R$, the renormalization of $\tilde{\epsilon}$ will have a similar form to Eq. (8) but with the last term replaced by $\alpha'(W/R)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. The mean energy of the optimal dislocation loop of radius R in a volume of order R^3 will thus be

$$\overline{D_R} \approx 2\pi R \left\{ \pi \ln R + \epsilon_0 - O\left[\epsilon_0^{\frac{2}{3}}, (\ln R)^{\frac{2}{3}} \right] \right\} \tag{9}$$

for large ϵ_0.

The largest scale $W \sim R$ should dominate the variations in D_R, yielding

$$\delta D_R \sim R << \overline{D_R}. \tag{10}$$

Large dislocation loops with negative energy will thus be very improbable. [13] Some small loops will of course appear for any ϵ_0. The effect of these in the presence of an applied $\nabla\varphi$ will decrease the effective long wavelength elastic constant of the vortex glass phase and concommitantly the mean energy of large dislocation loops by allowing spanning walls with small holes in them. But if ϵ_0 is greater than some critical value, ϵ_{0c}, these effects will only yield finite renormalizations and the elastic glass phase will be stable. In contrast, for $\epsilon_0 < \epsilon_{0c}$, $\tilde{\epsilon}_W$ will decrease with length scale eventually becoming negative and leading to the proliferation of dislocations of size greater than a correlation length ξ, even at zero temperature.

So far, we have focused on an unphysical limit of infinite h with ϵ_0 tuned by hand. But the results will apply much more generally. For weak randomness ($h << 1$) in a three dimensional X-Y magnet, the crossover length scale ξ_p above which the random fields become important diverges as $\xi_p \sim h^{-2}$. [2] On scales L larger than ξ_p, the randomness typically prevents the system from being able to find more than one optimal configuration in a region: another configuration that differed over most of a region of size L^3 would be expected to differ in energy by of order $h^4 L^3$ which, since this is much larger than the basic energy scale L for excitations and stiffness, is highly unlikely. Thus we expect configurations with different boundary conditions (or those differing by large dislocation loops) to differ substantially by other than multiples of 2π only on lower dimensional subsets: these will be domain walls with thickness $\sim \xi_p$.

Our analysis can be carried through for small h if the system is first coarse grained to a scale ξ_p. This yields an effective core energy $\tilde{\epsilon}_{\xi_p} \approx \pi \ln \xi_p$ from distances within ξ_p of the

dislocation since the energy on these scales is mostly the deterministic elastic energy. Larger scale deformations of a dislocation are similar to those studied above. If h is sufficiently small, $\tilde{\epsilon}_{\xi_p}$ will be large and the energy gained from optimizing the dislocation path will be small; the elastic glass phase will thus be *stable* for weak random fields.

The static properties of the elastic glass phase are somewhat subtle. The expected power law decay of $e^{i\phi}$ correlations in the model system [7] should also occur in the elastic glass phase of the X-Y random field system. The phase should also exhibit a non-zero elastic stiffness: a *mean* excess energy cost of order L if opposite boundary conditions on $\cos\varphi$ are applied at two ends. But its primary distinguishing features will be *dynamic* as are manifested in the analogous elastic vortex glass phase to which we now turn.

Aside from the complications of dislocations (and domain walls) with different Burgers' vectors and of coupling of the real and order parameter spaces, the arguments given above for X-Y random field magnets should apply also for three dimensional lattices in weak random potentials *both* for solids in porous media and for vortex lattices in dirty Type II superconductors. Power law singularities at Bragg peak positions should be observable in the resulting elastic glass phases, [7] especially if the exponent η is small. Furthermore, the absence of large scale dislocation loops means that the bond-orientational stiffness will *not* be local and, even though the randomness couples to the local lattice orientation, long range hexatic order should exist. [4, 7] But once dislocations proliferate, as the randomness is increased, the orientational stiffness will become short range and the randomness coupling to local bond orientations will make the system fully disordered. [4]

The dynamic properties of an ideal dislocation free elastic vortex glass phase have been extensively studied. [5] With only small scale dislocations present, the superconducting properties of this phase should persist provided that the phase is "commensurate" with one vortex per unit cell; [14] if not, the dynamics of the vacancy and the interstitial lines [14] will dominate the dynamics with the remaining vortices essentially frozen. One might worry that dislocation excitations rather than motion of sections of the lattice could dominate the dynamics, but their higher energy cost ($L \ln L$ vs. L) and less likelihood of having low

energy, argue against this.

For weak pinning, a first order transition directly to the commensurate elastic vortex glass should occur; this is the residual of the pure system melting transition that will occur regardless of the nature of the low temperature phase and is consistent with experiments. [15] For stronger pinning, various other phases might exist: a superconducting inelastic vortex glass phase with proliferated dislocations; [6] and incommensurate elastic glass phases that could be either superconducting or not. Investigation of possible phase diagrams and transitions, as well as development of the theoretical understanding of the simpler X-Y systems may have to await further progress in methods for analyzing these subtle systems.

I would like to thank David Huse, Terry Hwa and Matthew Fisher for useful conversations. This work is supported in part by the NSF via DMR 9106237, 9630064 and Harvard University's MRSEC.

REFERENCES

[1] A.I. Larkin and Yu. N. Ovchinikov, J. Low Temp Phys **34**, 409 (1979).

[2] For X-Y random field magnets, absence of ferromagnetism was predicted by Y. Imry and S.-K. Ma, Phys Rev Lett **35**, 1399 (1975).

[3] M. Aizenman and J. Wehr, Phys Rev Lett **62**, 2503 (1989).

[4] Destruction of hexatic order by randomness was argued by e.g. M.C. Marchetti and D.R. Nelson, Phys Rev B**41**, 1910 (1990).

[5] See G. Blatter et al, Rev Mod Phys **66**, 1125 (1994) and references therein.

[6] D.S. Fisher, M.P.A. Fisher and D.A. Huse, Phys Rev B**43**, 130 (1991).

[7] T. Giamarchi and P. Le Doussal, Phys Rev Lett **72**, 1530 (1994); Phys Rev B**52**, 1242 (1995).

[8] M.J.P. Gingras and D.A. Huse, Phys Rev B**53**, 15193 (1996).

[9] J. Kierfeld, T. Natterman, and T. Hwa, preprint cond-mat/9512101; D. Carpentier, P. Le Doussal and T. Giamarchi, Europhys Lett **35**, 379 (1996).

both consider the coupling together of two-dimensional elastic vortex glass layers. The relevance of the coupling they find does *not*, however, imply the existence of a stable three dimensional elastic glass phase. Both also give "variational" estimates of where the transition from an elastic glass phase to a disordered phase *would* occur if it does, but these calculations cannot resolve the delicate balance discussed here. Kierfeld et al also give a scaling argument for dislocation loop energies; however by considering tortuous dislocation paths, they drastically overestimate their energy invalidating their argument.

[10] J. Villain and J. Fernandez, Z Phys B**54**, 139 (1984); T. Natterman, Phys Rev Lett **64**, 2454 (1990).

[11] D.S. Fisher and D.A. Huse, Phys Rev B**38**, 386 (1988); **38**, 373 (1988).

[12] D.S. Fisher and D.A. Huse, Phys Rev B**43**, 10728 (1991); T. Hwa and T. Natterman, Phys Rev B**51**, 455 (1995).

[13] The distribution of $\Gamma \equiv (D_R - \overline{D}_R)/R$ should be scale invarient for large R in the elastic glass phase. If Prob $(\Gamma) \sim e^{a(-\Gamma)^\alpha}$ for large negative Γ, then one would expect a density of dislocation loops of radius R in the ground state of order $e^{-b(\ln R)^\alpha}$, illustrating the almost-marginal nature of the phase.

[14] E. Frey, D.R. Nelson and D.S. Fisher, Phys Rev B**49**, 9723 (1994).

[15] E. Zeldov et al, Nature **375**, 373 (1995); H. Pastoriza et al, Phys Rev Lett **72**, 295 (1994).